

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

By this amendment, claims 1-15 have been canceled in favor of new claims 16-29.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-15 have been rewritten as new claims 16-29, which comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is overcome and is inapplicable to new claims 16-29.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Batson et al. This rejection is traversed and is inapplicable to new claims 16-29 for the following reasons.

In the data reception apparatus recited in claim 16 (and the data reception method recited in claim 21) information separate from the actual media data is received enabling the setting of a time at which a request for the actual media data is sent to the respective data source containing the respective media data. Thus, the apparatus of claim 16 and the method of claim 21 receive first time information indicating the playback start times of the pieces of media data, and second time information indicating a time at which the pieces of media data should be requested from the data sources.

Based on this first and second time information, the apparatus of claim 16 and the method of claim 21 are able to set a data request time which is the time at which a request is sent for the actual media data to the respective data source. The data request time, which is set based on the first and second time information, is a time that is earlier than the playback start time by a specific respective time for each media data.

The apparatus of claim 16 and the method of claim 21 send a request for each media data at the data request time. Then, the apparatus of claim 16 and the method of claim 21 receive the actual media data from the data sources according to the requests.

In contrast, Batson et al. discloses a system comprising a scheduling unit which requires the actual multimedia data at or before a specified time in view of a latency time and an operation time of a memory device when retrieving multimedia data from the storage device on the network.

In the system of Batson et al., the scheduling device 104 only reads out data at or before a specified time from the memory device 102. In other words, the system of Batson et al. does not receive information separate from the actual media data, i.e., the first and second time information in order to set a data request time, which is a time at which a request is sent for the actual media data to the data source followed by the actual media data being sent.

In view of the distinctions discussed above, it is clear that claims 16-25 and 28 are not anticipated by Batson et al.

New claims 26 and 29 are drawn to transmission of media data including transmitting the first and second time information discussed above and then transmitting the actual media data according to requests that are based on the first and second time information.

In contrast, the system of Batson et al. does not transmit first and second information as recited in claims 26 and 28 from the transmitting side to the receiving side for each of the pieces of media data. Accordingly, claims 26 and 28 are not anticipated by Batson et al.

In view of the above, it is submitted that claims 16-29 are allowable over the prior art of record and that the present application is therefore in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yoshinori MATSUI

By: 

Jeffrey R. Filipek
Registration No. 41,471
Attorney for Applicant

JRF/edg
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 29, 2005